

**IN THE DRAWINGS:**

The attached sheets of formal drawings include corrections to Figures 1A – 20B.

These sheets replace the original Figures 1A – 20B.

Attachment: Replacement sheets.

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request consideration of this application. The drawing have been objected to for various reasons. Applicants submit corrected drawings for all figures (FIGS. 1A – 20B) and request removal of the objection. Claims 1, 2, 7, 14, 17, 19 – 21, and 25 – 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by United Kingdom patent document GB 2,315,162A to Behavior Tech Computer Corp. (hereinafter “Behavior Tech”). Claims 1 – 6, 8, 10, 12, 14 – 16, 17, and 24 – 27, and also 33 and 34 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the European patent document 996,010 A to Fujitsu Takamisawa Components L (JP) (hereinafter “Fujitsu”). Claims 14 – 16, and 19 – 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 5,986,277 A to Hon (hereinafter “Hon”). Claims 28, 29, and 32 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Patents of Japan, Publication No, 05-109333, 30 April 1993 to NEC Tohoku Ltd. (hereinafter “NEC”). Claims 1 and 2 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U. S. Patent 5,779,030 A to Ikegami et al. (hereinafter “Ikegami”). Claims 35 – 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Japanese patent document JP-55-096516 A to Pioneer Communications KK (hereinafter “Pioneer”). Claims 35 – 38 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by the Patents Abstract of Japan, Publication No. 06-103851 A (15 April 1994) (hereinafter “851 Publication”).

Claims 9 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Behavior Tech. Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujitsu. Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hon. Claims 30 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over NEC in view of U.S. Patent 3,969,600 to Sims, Jr. (hereinafter “Sims”).

Claims 11, 13, 18 and 23 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 8 and 19 have been amended to define pre-existing limitation more properly. The amendments are supported by the specification. No new matter has been added by the amendments. Claims 35 – 38 have been canceled without prejudice. No new claims have been added. As such, claims 1 – 34 remain pending in this application.

#### U.S.C. §102(b) Rejections

Independent claim 1 provides:

A keyswitch, comprising:

*a plurality of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs*, each of the plurality of legs having a bottom surface;

a spring to engage at least one of the bottom surfaces of the plurality of legs;

a keycap disposed above the plurality of legs; and

a base plate disposed below the spring. (emphasis added)

Behavior Tech discloses a keyboard switch having a first element 20 and a second element 30 with C-shaped bodies 21, 31. The pressing board 25 of the first element 20 presses against the pressing board 34 of the second element 30, and the protruded shaft 33 of the second element 30 forms a pressing condition, such that an inter-restricting state is formed between the first and second elements 20 and 30. (Behavior Tech, page 3, lines 20 – 34, and FIG. 2). Nothing in Behavior Tech discloses a plurality of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs.

Fujitsu disclose a key switch having a first link member 16 and a second link member 18, which have a mutually substantially identical shape, and which are assembled together

so as to be provided with a generally X-shape in a side view. Each of the link members 16, 18 includes two arms 32 extending parallel to each other, and a bar 34 mutually connecting the ends of the arms 32. Axles 36 are provided on one ends of the arms 32 to mutually coaxially project on the opposite sides to the bar 34. Axles 38 are provided on the other ends of the arms 32 to mutually coaxially project on the same sides as the axles 36. The first and second link members 16, 18 are arranged to mutually intersect and are pivotably connected relative to each other at an intersection thereof. More particularly, the first and second link members 16, 18 are pivotably connected with each other by pivots 40 provided at generally longitudinal centers of the respective pair of arms 32. (Fujitsu, page 11, lines 1 – 19, and FIG. 1). Nothing in Fujitsu discloses a plurality of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs.

Ikegami discloses a link plate 220 which is integrally injection-molded for guiding and supporting the upward and downward actuations of the key top 250. The link plate 220 includes the first and second link parts 221 and 222 integrally connected through the connecting plate 230, and the upward and downward actuations are possible in a crossing manner owing to the elasticity of the connecting plate 230. A connecting plate 230 integrally connects first link part 221 and a second link part 222. (Ikegami, col. 7, lines 7 – 15, and FIG. 6B). As such, the first and second link parts form one continuous piece with connecting plate 230. Nothing in Ikegami discloses a plurality of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs.

In contrast, claim 1 includes the limitation of “a plurality of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs.” As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is not anticipated by Behavior Tech, Fujitsu, or Ikegami under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection. Claims 2 – 7 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, and thus include the limitation of “a plurality

of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs.” As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 2 – 7 are also not anticipated by Behavior Tech, Fujitsu, or Ikegami under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection.

Independent claim 8 provides:

A keyswitch, comprising:

***a plurality of legs interleaved together*** and having sides without flanges;

a key cap disposed above the plurality of legs; and

a base plate disposed below the plurality of legs, wherein the plurality of legs is constructed from a material comprising a metal.

(emphasis added)

Fujitsu disclose a key switch having a first link member 16 and a second link member 18, which have a mutually substantially identical shape, and which are assembled together so as to be provided with a generally X-shape in a side view. Each of the link members 16, 18 includes two arms 32 extending parallel to each other, and a bar 34 mutually connecting the ends of the arms 32. Axles 36 are provided on one ends of the arms 32 to mutually coaxially project on the opposite sides to the bar 34. Axles 38 are provided on the other ends of the arms 32 to mutually coaxially project on the same sides as the axles 36. The first and second link members 16, 18 are arranged to mutually intersect and are pivotably connected relative to each other at an intersection thereof. More particularly, the first and second link members 16, 18 are pivotably connected with each other by pivots 40 provided at generally longitudinal centers of the respective pair of arms 32. (Fujitsu, page 11, lines 1 – 19, and FIG. 1). Nothing in Fujitsu discloses a plurality of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs. Nothing in Fujitsu teaches a plurality of legs interleaved together and having sides without flanges.

In contrast, independent claim 8 includes the limitation of “a plurality of legs interleaved together and having sides without flanges.” As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 8 is not anticipated Fujitsu under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection. Claims 10 and 12 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 8, and thus include the limitation of “a plurality of legs interleaved together and having sides without flanges.” As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 10 and 12 are also not anticipated by Fujitsu under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection.

Independent claim 14 provides:

A keyswitch, comprising:

*a plurality of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs* to form a scissor-like arrangement, the plurality of legs having sides without flanges.

(emphasis added)

Behavior Tech discloses a keyboard switch having a first element 20 and a second element 30 with C-shaped bodies 21, 31. The pressing board 25 of the first element 20 presses against the pressing board 34 of the second element 30, and the protruded shaft 33 of the second element 30 forms a pressing condition, such that an inter-restricting state is formed between the first and second elements 20 and 30. (Behavior Tech, page 3, lines 20 – 34, and FIG. 2). Nothing in Behavior Tech discloses a plurality of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs.

Fujitsu disclose a key switch having a first link member 16 and a second link member 18, which have a mutually substantially identical shape, and which are assembled together so as to be provided with a generally X-shape in a side view. Each of the link members 16, 18 includes two arms 32 extending parallel to each other, and a bar 34 mutually connecting

the ends of the arms 32. Axles 36 are provided on one ends of the arms 32 to mutually coaxially project on the opposite sides to the bar 34. Axles 38 are provided on the other ends of the arms 32 to mutually coaxially project on the same sides as the axles 36. The first and second link members 16, 18 are arranged to mutually intersect and are pivotably connected relative to each other at an intersection thereof. More particularly, the first and second link members 16, 18 are pivotably connected with each other by pivots 40 provided at generally longitudinal centers of the respective pair of arms 32. (Fujitsu, page 11, lines 1 – 19, and FIG. 1). Nothing in Fujitsu discloses a plurality of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs.

Hon discloses a a keyswitch key 99 having a base 10, first pivotable arm means 20, second pivotable arm means 30, and a keycap 40. The base 10 is a square structure defining a hole 11 in a central portion thereof, four retaining members 12 are formed around the hole 11 and arranged as two parallel in-line pairs, and two sockets 14 are formed around the hole 11 opposite each other. The first pivotable arm means 20 is substantially a U-shaped arm including a bridging portion 22 pivotably received in the two in-line retaining members 12 of the base 10 and two parallel branches 24 connected by the bridging portion 22. The first pivotable arm means 20 is rotatable when the bridging portion 22 is pivotally retained in the in-line pair of retaining members 12. The bridging portion 22 is a rod integrated with a plate 25 which is connected to the intermediates of the rod and the two parallel branches 24 of the U-shaped arm 20. The integrated plate 25 functions as a reinforce for strengthening the rod 22. (Hon, col. 3, lines 1 – 15, and FIG. 1). Nothing in Hon discloses a plurality of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs.

In contrast, claim 14 includes the limitation of “a plurality of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs.” As such, Applicants

respectfully submit that claim 14 is not anticipated by Behavior Tech, Fujitsu, or Hon under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection. Claims 15 – 17 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 14, and thus include the limitation of “a plurality of legs interleaved together without a pivot point approximately central to the plurality of legs.” As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 15 – 17 are also not anticipated by Behavior Tech, Fujitsu, or Hon under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection.

Independent claim 19 provides:

A keyswitch comprising:

first and second legs each having a first end and a second end, the first end having two lower protrusions and the second end having upper protrusions, ***the lower protrusions of the second leg disposed between the lower protrusions of the first leg without a central pivot,*** and

a base having a plurality of retaining clips, each of the lower protrusions of the first and second legs pivotally engaged with a corresponding one of the plurality of retaining clips, and each of the upper protrusions extended towards a cap. (emphasis added)

Behavior Tech discloses a keyboard switch having a first element 20 and a second element 30 with C-shaped bodies 21, 31. The pressing board 25 of the first element 20 presses against the pressing board 34 of the second element 30, and the protruded shaft 33 of the second element 30 forms a pressing condition, such that an inter-restricting state is formed between the first and second elements 20 and 30. (Behavior Tech, page 3, lines 20 – 34, and FIG. 2).

Nothing in Behavior Tech discloses the lower protrusions of a second leg disposed between the lower protrusions of a first leg without a central pivot.

Hon discloses a a keyswitch key 99 having a base 10, first pivotable arm means 20, second pivotable arm means 30, and a keycap 40. The base 10 is a square structure defining a hole 11 in a central portion thereof, four retaining members 12 are formed around the hole 11 and arranged as two parallel in-line pairs, and two sockets 14 are formed around the hole 11 opposite each other. The first pivotable arm means 20 is substantially a U-shaped arm including a bridging portion 22 pivotably received in the two in-line retaining members 12 of the base 10 and two parallel branches 24 connected by the bridging portion 22. The first pivotable arm means 20 is rotatable when the bridging portion 22 is pivotally retained in the in-line pair of retaining members 12. The bridging portion 22 is a rod integrated with a plate 25 which is connected to the intermediates of the rod and the two parallel branches 24 of the U-shaped arm 20. The integrated plate 25 functions as a reinforce for strengthening the rod 22. (Hon, col. 3, lines 1 – 15, and FIG. 1). Nothing in Hon discloses the lower protrusions of a second leg disposed between the lower protrusions of a first leg without a central pivot.

In contrast, claim 19 includes the limitation of “the lower protrusions of the second leg disposed between the lower protrusions of the first leg without a central pivot.” As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 19 is not anticipated by Behavior Tech or Hon under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection. Claims 20 – 21 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 19, and thus include the limitation of “the lower protrusions of the second leg disposed between the lower protrusions of the first leg without a central pivot.” As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 20 – 21 are also not anticipated by Behavior Tech or Hon under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection.

Independent claim 25 provides:

A keyswitch, comprising:

first and second legs each having a first end and a second end,  
**the first end and the second end being separated in height by less  
than approximately 1 millimeter to reduce a thickness of the  
keyswitch.** (emphasis added)

Behavior Tech discloses a keyboard switch having a first element 20 and a second element 30 with C-shaped bodies 21, 31. The pressing board 25 of the first element 20 presses against the pressing board 34 of the second element 30, and the protruded shaft 33 of the second element 30 forms a pressing condition, such that an inter-restricting state is formed between the first and second elements 20 and 30. (Behavior Tech, page 3, lines 20 – 34, and FIG. 2).

Nothing in Behavior Tech discloses the first end and the second end of legs being separated in height by less than approximately 1 millimeter to reduce a thickness of the keyswitch.

Fujitsu disclose a key switch having a first link member 16 and a second link member 18, which have a mutually substantially identical shape, and which are assembled together so as to be provided with a generally X-shape in a side view. Each of the link members 16, 18 includes two arms 32 extending parallel to each other, and a bar 34 mutually connecting the ends of the arms 32. Axles 36 are provided on one ends of the arms 32 to mutually coaxially project on the opposite sides to the bar 34. Axles 38 are provided on the other ends of the arms 32 to mutually coaxially project on the same sides as the axles 36. The first and second link members 16, 18 are arranged to mutually intersect and are pivotably connected relative to each other at an intersection thereof. More

particularly, the first and second link members 16, 18 are pivotably connected with each other by pivots 40 provided at generally longitudinal centers of the respective pair of arms 32. (Fujitsu, page 11, lines 1 – 19, and FIG. 1). Nothing in Fujitsu discloses the first end and the second end of legs being separated in height by less than approximately 1 millimeter to reduce a thickness of the keyswitch.

In contrast, claim 25 includes the limitation of “the first end and the second end being separated in height by less than approximately 1 millimeter to reduce a thickness of the keyswitch.” As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 25 is not anticipated by Behavior Tech or Fujitsu under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection. Claims 26 – 27 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 25, and thus include the limitation of “the first end and the second end being separated in height by less than approximately 1 millimeter to reduce a thickness of the keyswitch.” As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 26 – 27 are also not anticipated by Behavior Tech or Fujitsu under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection.

Independent claim 28 provides:

A keyswitch, comprising:

a cap; and

a plurality of legs supporting the cap, **each of the plurality of legs being a leaf spring that has a cantilevered structure** formed by the plurality of legs engaged to each other to support parallel up and down movement of the cap. (emphasis added)

NEC discloses a plate spring 4 arranged between a key-top 1 and a housing 5 to support the key-top 1 and to give it return force. A push-down shaft

3 is integrally provided in the rear surface of the key-top 1 to perform the switching operation of a contact piece 8 without touching the housing 5. A hook 2 and a stopper 6 deter the upward movement of the key-top 1. Nothing in NEC discloses or shows, by way of figures, each of the plurality of legs being a leaf spring that has a cantilevered structure.

In contrast, independent claim 28 includes the limitation of “each of the plurality of legs being a leaf spring that has a cantilevered structure.” As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 28 is not anticipated by NEC under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection. Claims 29 and 32 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 28, and thus include the limitation of “each of the plurality of legs being a leaf spring that has a cantilevered structure.” As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 29 and 32 are also not anticipated by NEC under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection.

Independent claim 34 provides:

A keyswitch, comprising:

a support;

a cap having a top and a bottom; and

a pair of legs coupled to the bottom of the cap and coupled to the support, and ***wherein the keyswitch has a height, when fully depressed of less than approximately 2.5 millimeters from the top to the support to reduce a thickness of the keyswitch.***

(emphasis added)

Fujitsu disclose a key switch having a first link member 16 and a second link member 18, which have a mutually substantially identical shape, and which are assembled together so as to be provided with a generally X-shape in a side

view. Each of the link members 16, 18 includes two arms 32 extending parallel to each other, and a bar 34 mutually connecting the ends of the arms 32. Axles 36 are provided on one ends of the arms 32 to mutually coaxially project on the opposite sides to the bar 34. Axles 38 are provided on the other ends of the arms 32 to mutually coaxially project on the same sides as the axles 36. The first and second link members 16, 18 are arranged to mutually intersect and are pivotably connected relative to each other at an intersection thereof. More particularly, the first and second link members 16, 18 are pivotably connected with each other by pivots 40 provided at generally longitudinal centers of the respective pair of arms 32. (Fujitsu, page 11, lines 1 – 19, and FIG. 1). Nothing in Fujitsu discloses a keyswitch having a height, when fully depressed of less than approximately 2.5 millimeters from the top to the support to reduce a thickness of the keyswitch.

In contrast, claim 34 includes the limitation of “wherein the keyswitch has a height, when fully depressed of less than approximately 2.5 millimeters from the top to the support to reduce a thickness of the keyswitch.” As such, Applicants respectfully submit that claim 34 is not anticipated Fujitsu under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) and request removal of the rejection.

### 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claims 9 and 22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Behavior Tech. The Office Action states that “each leg has its own geometric center determine by shape and mass and each leg is made of an undulating shape due to the mass and shape portions 25 or 34 thereby constituting well known design criteria which would have been obvious to one skilled in the switch arts at the time applicant’s invention was made.” (Office

Action dated 08/26/03, page 6). Claim 9 depends from independent claim 8 and thus includes the limitation of “a plurality of legs interleaved together and having sides without flanges.” As discussed above, Behavior Tech discloses a keyboard switch having a first element 20 and a second element 30 with C-shaped bodies 21, 31. Nothing in Behavior Tech teaches or suggests a plurality of legs interleaved together and having sides without flanges. Here, the Office Action merely states that the legs have an undulating shape without explaining what specific understanding or technological principle within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art would have suggested shape. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 22 depends from independent claim 19 and thus includes the limitation of “the lower protrusions of the second leg disposed between the lower protrusions of the first leg without a central pivot.” The Office Action states that “each leg has its own geometric center determine by shape and mass and each leg is made of an undulating shape due to the mass and shape portions 25 or 34 thereby constituting well known design criteria which would have been obvious to one skilled in the switch arts at the time applicant’s invention was made.” (Office Action dated 08/26/03, page 6). Nothing in Behavior Tech teaches or suggests the lower protrusions of the second leg disposed between the lower protrusions of the first leg without a central pivot. Here, the Office Action merely states that the legs have an undulating shape without explaining what specific understanding or technological principle within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art would have suggested shape. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 9 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fujitsu. Claim 9 depends from independent claim 8 and thus includes the limitation of “a plurality of legs interleaved together and having sides without flanges.” The Office Action states “it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made that each of the legs of each actuating mechanism illustrated in figures 6 – 9 and 25 – 28B has its own geometric center determine by shape and mass and each leg has an undulating configuration.” (Office Action dated 08/26/03, page 7). As discussed above, Fujitsu disclose a key switch having a first link member 16 and a second link member 18, which have a mutually substantially identical shape, and which are assembled together so as to be provided with a generally X-shape in a side view. Nothing in Fujitsu teaches or suggests a plurality of legs interleaved together and having sides without flanges. Here, the Office Action merely states that the legs have an undulating shape without explaining what specific understanding or technological principle within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art would have suggested shape. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hon. Claim 22 depends from independent claim 19 and thus includes the limitation of “the lower protrusions of the second leg disposed between the lower protrusions of the first leg without a central pivot.” The Office Action states that “it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made that each of the legs 20, 30 of each actuating mechanism illustrated in figures 1 and 3 has its own geometric center determine by shape and mass and each leg has an undulating configuration.” (Office Action dated 08/26/03, page

7). As discussed above, Hon discloses a keyswitch key 99 having a base 10, first pivotable arm means 20, second pivotable arm means 30, and a keycap 40. Nothing in Hon teaches or suggests the lower protrusions of the second leg disposed between the lower protrusions of the first leg without a central pivot. Here, the Office Action merely states that the legs have an undulating shape without explaining what specific understanding or technological principle within the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art would have suggested shape. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

Claims 30 and 31 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over NEC in view of Sims. The Office Action states that "it would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to modify the legs of Japanese switch support to include spring supports made of metal as suggested by Sims to provide more flexibility in the resilient part of the actuating system." (Office Action dated 08/26/03, page 8). Claim 30 and 31 depend from independent claim 28 and thus includes the limitation of "each of the plurality of legs being a leaf spring that has a cantilevered structure." As discussed above, NEC discloses a plate spring 4 arranged between a key-top 1 and a housing 5 to support the key-top 1 and to give it return force. Nothing in NEC teaches or suggests each of the plurality of legs being a leaf spring that has a cantilevered structure.

Sims discloses a key assembly having a keytop 28 which travels down or up in the before-mentioned aperture 12 in response to downward force supplied to the keytop 28 itself or upward force applied by a yieldingly resistive spring 30 which buckles when force is applied. The buckle spring 30 itself has a beam

member 32 and abutment legs 34 at each end for support. (Sims, col. 3, lines 15 – 20, and FIGS. 1 – 3). Nothing in Sims teaches or suggests each of the plurality of legs being a leaf spring that has a cantilevered structure. As such, Sims fails to cure the deficiencies of NEC. Moreover, even if NEC and Sims were combined, the combination would not include all the limitations of claim 28, of which claims 30 and 31 depend. In particular, substituting the spring from Sims with the spring of NEC would not result in a keyswitch with each of the plurality of legs being a leaf spring that has a cantilevered structure. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In conclusion, Applicants respectfully submit that in view of the amendments and arguments set forth herein, the applicable rejections have been overcome. In light of the canceled claims, the applicable rejections are now moot. If the allowance of these claims could be facilitated by a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to contact Suk Lee at (408) 720-8300. If there are any additional charges, please charge our Deposit Account No. 02 – 2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP



---

Suk S. Lee  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 47,745

Dated: December 24, 2003

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1030  
(408) 720-8300